

## **II. Remarks**

The Office has rejected claims 12-15 and 17-20 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, stating that the claims are "indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention." Office Action, page 3. Specifically, the Office has alleged that claim 12 has two indefinite wherein clauses and insufficient antecedent basis for a term. *See* Office Action, page 3. The Office has also specifically alleged that claims 15 and 17 have insufficient antecedent basis for certain terms recited therein. *See Id.* The Office did not comment on claims 13, 14, 18, 19, and 20. Accordingly, it is presumed that said claims are rejected due to their dependency upon claims 12, 15, or 17 and would be allowable if written in independent form.

In order to further clarify, but not further limit, the claimed subject matter, Applicant has amended claims 12, 15, and 17. Support for the amendments exists throughout the specification, and no new matter has been added. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 12-15 and 17-20 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request prompt notice thereof.

It is believed that no fees are necessary in connection with the filing of this paper. However, if the Commissioner determines that fees are necessary, or if a petition is required for acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No 041133 for any such fees, and Applicants hereby make any such petition.

Date: April 15, 2010

Respectfully submitted,  
Dinsmore & Shohl, LLP,  
/joel B. cloud/  
Joel B. Cloud  
Reg. No. 56,764  
(614) 628-6933  
(614) 628-6890 (fax)  
jcloud@dinslaw.com